Project Managers' Advisory Group

MINUTES
March 19, 2007

Attending:

Sharon Hayes	EPMO
Alisa Cutler	EPMO
Bob Giannuzzi	EPMO
Jesus Lopez	EPMO
Gaye Mays	EPMO
Steve Tedder	EPMO
Barbara Swartz	ITS
Jim Tulenko	ITS
Todd Russ	ITS
LaQuita Hudson	ITS
Chip Moore	ITS
Pattie Bowers	ITS
Kathy Bromead	ITS
Stan Jenkins	ITS/ETS
Vicky Kumar	DOT
Cheryl Ritter	DOT
Annette Murphy	DPI
Lynn Beck	DHHS/DMH
Joe Cimbala	DMH/DD/SAS
Charles Fraley	DHHS/DRM
Chris Cline	NCCCS
James Skinner	Dept of Insurance
Sarah Joyner	ESC
Janet Flanders	DOR
Frank Seiber	DOL
Kevin Greene	NC DST
George Fenton	DOJ
Shane Sangster	DST
Randy Moody	DENR
Deborah Webb	NCIC
Dell Pinkston	DOA

Bob Giannuzzi welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked first-time participants to introduce themselves. **Frank Seiber** from Dept. of Labor; **Kathy Bromead, Stan Jenkins, Chip Moore** and **Pattie Bowers** all of ITS and **Kevin Green** of the Treasurer's Office, introduced themselves.

Sharon Hayes presented Kathy Bromead with a framed letter of congratulation signed by George Bakolia, for her successful completion of the PMP certification.

Bob called for approval of the February minutes – approved.

Jesus Lopez reported that there is a waiting list of 40 for the PMP Prep class. He advised that Cycle 5 training will start on April 3rd. He noted he will be sending out the final roster at

the end of this week. **Sharon Hayes** emphasized that the class is intended only for those seriously intending to take the PMP exam. However, she would consider offering basic PM training if others were interested.

Sharon Hayes announced that OSP has decided to eliminate the temporary classes of IT PM I, II and III. Guidance has been provided for moving PMs in these classes to currently available IT Banded Classes. She offered to help if anyone in management needs assistance in executing this transition. **Sharon** intends to resume development of IT PM bands after the moratorium on new banding is lifted.

NCPMI news was covered next. Bob reported that the annual event has been scheduled for 9/13 and moved to the McKimmon Center to accommodate more people. **Sharon** informed that **Steve Tedder** has been rescheduled for the 4/5 Public Sector LIG meeting, speaking on *Earned Value*. **Lynne Beck** spoke highly about Neal Whitten's presentation on communicating with management at the March general membership meeting. She offered to share handouts if anyone were interested.

Next there was a presentation on the project approval process that had been given to the agency CIOs last fall (The slides are posted on the EPMO website, http://www.epmo.scio.nc.gov/, under *Presentations*.). **Sharon** prefaced the presentation by informing the group that the EPMO is slated to be audited on its effectiveness in facilitating project success – schedule, cost and full function. Results will be shared with the group. She also emphasized that her approval board is focused on advocacy of the agencies' acquiring approval through the SCIO. **Sharon** covered the EPMO, OSBM and OSC roles. **Stan Jenkins** discussed ETS's focus on the alignment with NC statewide technical architecture and participation in RFP reviews prior to both posting and award. **Chip Moore** spoke on his security role to ensure that controls and compliance are in place to minimize risk. **Patti Bowers** highlighted IT Procurement's role in the project, posting and award approval processes. She stated that the requirement for Gate 1 approval prior to posting an RFP has been of great benefit to the procurement process. Several interesting questions were answered by the speakers. **Sharon** offered that any further questions can be emailed to her.

Bob Giannuzzi reminded the group that the PMAs are available to assist in project cost benefit analysis. **Sharon** stated that the EPMO is planning to follow up on how to track benefit realization.

Sharon pointed out that there is a formal process for making changes to the workflow. She plans to meet semiannually meetings with the CIOs so they can better understand the process.

Bob Giannuzzi called for updates from the Task Groups.

- *Workflow* **Jesus Lopez** reported that this group would be meeting 3/20; will provide feedback at next PMAG meeting.
- *PM Tools* **Gaye Mays** reported that the team attended a demo of the SAP basic project management tool xRPM. Feedback was positive overall. The xRPM module is bundled with SAP's Portfolio Management tool. Jim Tulenko has sent a list of questions regarding portfolio management to SAP. We are currently waiting for their response. Once the response is received and there are no "show stoppers" identified, we will schedule a more in-depth demo of the xRPM product. All agencies will be notified of the additional demo/demos and are welcome to attend and provide input. **Sharon** urged agencies to participate in the activities of the group to avoid questions later on.

- *Methodology* **Alisa Cutler** reported that they were still working on the project closeout process.

Bob passed out the following information on upcoming teleconferences of interest to the PM Advisory Group.

Organization/website	Contacts	Upcoming Calls
http://www.nascio.org/committees/projectManagement/documents/PY2007CallSchedule.pdf	Stephan Jamison 859/514-9148 sjamison@AMRms.com Access 888/272-7337 conference ID 6916986	April 3 (3:00) **Looking Beyond Traditional Project Metrics**
PMO Executive Council http://www.pmo.executiveboard.com/PMOEC/1,3241,,00.html	Register at website	March 21 (12:00) **Key Trends in PM Career Paths**
Application Executive Council http://www.aec.executiveboard.com/	Register at website	March 22 (11:00) **Managing Scope Change Across the Delivery Lifecycle** April 12 (11:00) **Agile Techniques**
Infrastructure Executive Council http://www.iec.executiveboard.com/	Register at website	April 17 (11:00) **The IEC Service Cost Model**
Information Risk Executive Council http://www.irec.executiveboard.com/	Register at website	April 17 (11:00) **Business Workflow Risk Assessments**
Enterprise Architecture Executive Council http://www.eaec.executiveboard.com/	Register at website	April 24 (12:00) **Managing the IT Portfolio for Business Value**

Bob Giannuzzi stated that another set of training sessions in Requirements and RFP development is under consideration. Anyone interested should email him. **Bob** is also looking into bringing in some MS Project training. **Charles Fraley** mentioned the possibility of forming a focal group for sharing information and questions on procurement related issues and experiences.

Charles reported that a local chapter of the International Institute of Business Analysis (IIBA) has been formed. This organization has a BA certification program that may be of interest to the agencies. For more information, go to http://raleigh.theiiba.org**.**

Jim Tulenko reported that they had been working with Microsoft to resolve the recent issues experienced with the PPM tool. He asked that anyone experiencing a lot of problems to let him know. He also requested that agencies volunteer to test the next release which is slated for deployment the end of April. Performance is expected to improve.

Bob distributed a summary of Lessons Learned (attached) of projects completed since the last meeting.

Sharon informed members of the submission of a new senate bill S879. This bill calls for additional PMs on larger projects as well as increasing the threshold for designation of PMAs to one million dollars.

Meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.

Lessons Learned Documentation

Exhibit A

ITS Video Network Services, Web Conferencing Upgrade

1. **LESSONS LEARNED** - What were the **positive** lessons learned (project strengths) from this effort?

All costs associated with the project must be estimated and documented prior to the start of the project. Time must be taken to properly figure ALL costs associated with the project at time of project registration.

Exhibit B

ITS Organizational Excellence Program Phase 1

1. **LESSONS LEARNED** - What were the **positive** lessons learned (project strengths) from this effort?

a. The training plan called for the majority of personnel to be trained on the concepts and processes being implemented. This went a long way to easing any attendant issues concerning cultural change.

b. Training created a base of expertise that in turn generated highly capable design teams.

c. A governance model that involved all key management in the design and implementation of the project was an important factor in success, management buy-in and thoroughly coordinated efforts.

d. Significant planning, with input from industry experts, created the proper scope with feasible goals and objectives backed up by detailed implementation planning.

e. Development of multi-functional design teams with representation from all key elements in the organization greatly facilitated thorough, accurate process designs that accounted for all agency specific requirements.

f. Obtaining a document technician has improved documentation immeasurably.

g. Providing advanced, practitioner level training to the design teams resulted in more detailed, professional process designs.

h. The message to customer agencies was clear and initial results made a large impact, several agencies have begun similar efforts.

i. Use of customer based focus groups assisted in getting feedback on user level requirements.

2. **LESSONS LEARNED** - What **opportunities for improvements** (project weaknesses) were learned with this project?

a. Initial tool planning did not have the benefit of a project manager, adjustments became necessary. Bring the PM on early in the effort.

b. Initial planning did not take into account the extent of time required for document review and approval. Future planning will address this issue.

c. Tool challenges should be addressed in planning stages to ensure time is made available for inevitable enhancements required.

d. Plan for the services of a document technician in this document centric project.

e. Address cross process coordination requirements that do not necessarily show up in plans. Time for this is required and becomes even more important as more processes are addressed.

Exhibit C

DHHS – Office of MMIS Service, MAS AR/P

1. **LESSONS LEARNED** - What were the **positive** lessons learned (project strengths) from this effort?

- Early buy-in of the project by the user divisions was critical. Project kickoff meetings helped meet this need.
- In addition to having periodic scheduled status/update meetings, the project also offered a standing ad hoc meeting where the project team was available for anyone associated with the project to come and discuss any item. If no one showed up, then there was no meeting. This gave the users a feeling that they were not forced to attend meaningless meetings.
- Informal communication (phone calls, email) with user divisions contributed to the success of this project. This communication was in addition to documented status reports and meetings.

2. **LESSONS LEARNED** - What **opportunities for improvements** (project weaknesses) were learned with this project?

- Even though flexibility was built into the schedule for user reviews; users often took longer to respond than the time allotted. This was due to vacations and more often a conflict with the users' daily assigned tasks. This situation will exist with multi-divisional projects; it will take a

strong commitment from executive management to announce and enforce the reviewers' priorities.

- The schedule did not allow for sufficient time for the project team to correct and revise deliverables after receiving feedback from the user divisions. Future projects should not underestimate the complexity of understanding reviewers' comments addressing the necessary changes to deliverables.

Exhibit D

DOT - MMS Handheld System

Factors that Promoted Success
• Leveraging the expertise and the customer relationship management skills of the SRMU Field Support team to train and mentor the participants in the use of the devices. During the project maintenance crews used the devices to perform their daily work functions and capture work accomplished and location data in the field, where their work is performed. Crew users, (many of whom were first-time computer users) who received the most one-on-one support by the Field Support team had the best experiences. • A gradual rollout to 15 crews in the selected organizations enhanced success.
• Providing use of one type of device by one group of crew teams, and then swapping the devices with the other group midway into the proof-of-concept. This ensured each device was used for all functions before swapping to another device – providing a fair assessment of the two device types. • While these specific devices will not be the actual make and model of device(s) implemented, a choice of device size and degree of durability was trialed. One was small and compact; while the other was larger and more rugged. Simplifying the complexity of choices and feature options helped to focus the users on the overall objective of facilitating remote data entry. Given the limited scope of the proof-of-concept, portability was favored by the end users and field support (getting help) was favored over durability. • Given that preference for the more portable model, it is likely that the integration of the GPS into the handheld device would further enhance portability and ease of use.
• The vendor requested that participants capture redundant data: GPS readings (coordinates), as well as route section and from/to milepoints, so the Project could assess the accuracy of the GPS readings. There was an 80% success rate in obtaining GPS readings, with high 'ground' accuracy, as shown by the fact that in 80% of cases the point captured fell within 10 feet of a mapped road centerline and 95% were within 50 ft. • Early problem reporting related to GPS use allowed the field support team members to check out the process and get the people experiencing problems back on track, resulting in a majority of respondents finding the GPS devices easy to use overall. Acquiring units with an integrated GPS should further ease the usability.
Factors that Would Enhance Success
• Learning this lesson can promote success in the future for feasibility studies involving new devices or hardware in general. • This project's outcome enhanced institutional knowledge that no single device or vendor, most likely, can realistically be the basis for future acquisitions. • From the beginning and for the duration, the enterprise should expect more diversity and mix of devices, because the technology is changing rapidly and being bundled with general purpose capabilities.
• When electing to perform a proof-of-concept in a production environment, involvement of, and roles for support staff need to be considered to better mitigate business risks. DOT business clients need to understand the importance of a sufficient level of IT support. • The IT support team did complete an independent checkout of the remote data entry software in the QC environment in accordance with the plan, verifying access via the statewide network, prior to training. The team also followed up with minimal support (limited by the business client) to the production MMS, averting some of the potential adverse impacts. At the request of the project sponsor, IT drafted summary

recommendations for project review, and for future production deployment of handheld devices across the state. • Alternatively, this could have been done in the QC environment, without having as many safeguards in place. • Nevertheless a positive outcome (value add) was that the production Oracle database schema now includes the enhancements necessary for immediate use of the handheld devices if software licensing issues are resolved.
• Providing a device and demonstration of the remote data entry software to the IT support team and the customer's sponsor, early in the project plan, would have facilitated planning, subsequent deliverable review, and formulation of recommendations. • Providing devices to trainers in the one location would have better enabled their familiarization with the devices after initial training and assisted them in tailoring their training approaches and in confirming findings reported remotely. • Assigning a device to the IT Application Administrator would have facilitated support of the remote data entry software, to help mitigate events that did have small impacts on the production system. • Providing devices to IT Technical Services would have facilitated testing of the devices and any replacement accessories prior to redeployment to the field and assured returns in accordance with warranty provisions.
• Everyone worked in a spirit of cooperation to make this a success, but planning for the trainers to develop a greater comfort level would be a big payback improvement to consider in future proof-of-concept feasibilities. • While detailed user guides prepared by the vendor reinforced the just-in-time training, the field support trainers needed more time working with the devices in the field, to reinforce their own training prior to proceeding to train the end users. Allocating more time for trainer familiarization would have enhanced the experience for all the stakeholders the trainers interfaced with.

Exhibit E

Grants Sub-recipient and Sub-contractors

LESSONS LEARNED - What were the **positive** lessons learned (project strengths) from this effort?

1. Getting strong end user involvement in the requirements phase was critical to success. It was important for us to understand their requirements, and for them to understand how their processes would be impacted.
2. Maintaining user involvement throughout the process was also critical. As major pieces of functionality were completed, we presented it to the end users for their review and feedback.
3. Having team members that were knowledgeable of DOT business processes and the existing system functionality greatly added in the success of the project.
4. Providing on-site support immediately following implementation helped the users quickly gain a clear understanding of how to efficiently use the functionality to perform their business processes. This support was incorporated into the project plan.

LESSONS LEARNED - What **opportunities for improvements** (project weaknesses) were learned with this project?

1. It is important to allow additional time in the schedule when there are external parties involved in the project. In this case, we had project delays resulting from resolving reporting questions with the Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Aviation Agency.

Exhibit F

ITS - North Carolina Identification (NCID) System

1. **LESSONS LEARNED** - What were the **positive** lessons learned (project strengths) from this effort?

   - Clear roles and responsibilities for project team members aid in setting expectations and evaluating workload across the team members, which in turn increases successful completion of assigned tasks and execution of established processes (testing, change management, etc.).

   - A solid test plan that is based on requirements increases the probability that the system delivered will be successful. The solid test plan enabled ITS CS Directory Services to identify defects to ensure the system functioned properly.

   - The communication plan was well executed and kept all team members abreast of status, issues, risks and plans going forward. The weekly meetings enabled ITS to openly hold the vendor to obligations

- Establishing a team environment and a sense of pride can be critical to achieve results given time and/or resource constraints. Several team members stepped up to help complete tasks as needed.

- Having a representative user base involved throughout the project lifecycle will aid in achieving the correct results/outcomes for the users of the system.

2. **LESSONS LEARNED** - What **<u>opportunities for improvements</u>** (project weaknesses) were learned with this project?

- Requirements and scope statement must be finalized and signed off before proceeding.
- Entering into contracts with vendors undergoing a merger and acquisition should be considered very carefully given the acquiring corporation may not adhere to the established contract.
- All stakeholders should be clearly identified and their requirements documented and traced (to system requirements, to design, through testing and implementation) throughout the project lifecycle.
- Ensure vendor understands their role and assumes appropriate accountability. Vendor role, responsibilities and accountability should be cleared stated in the contract.
- Include PM in the project as soon as possible, preferably in the Initiation phase to ensure a higher probability of successful execution by leveraging the PM's experience.
- Must finalize requirements and scope statement before proceeding
- Executive management must allow for appropriate execution of a project to improve the probability of success. In other words, the project manager should have the authority to manage the project using best practices.
- If deliverables are specified in a contract, clearly defined acceptance criteria must be established to ensure usefulness and high quality of deliverables being developed.

Exhibit G

DHHS - CSDW Hardware Migration

1. **LESSONS LEARNED** - What were the **positive** lessons learned (project strengths) from this effort?

- *SCIO Approval Process*
  - Architecture: define as much details as you know how. It causes more work and discussions up front but removes future obstacles.
  - Architecture: define business and network view. Use more than one page if the diagram becomes illegible. We separated users from developers. It made the documents easier to read and review.
  - Review all your interfaces, external and internal and the mode of communication (FTP, WWW). Useful for security review and zoning.
  - Server Farm requests: easier to create and review them if you have detailed your architecture.
  - Business Case: make it compelling. If you have many heavy hitter benefits, use those and do not worry about the small ones, unless they speak to visibility or prestige.

- *Project Planning*
  - If ITS is the outsourcing vendor, allow at least 20% of slack in your schedule (the 9 months CSDW migration had an obvious 2 months slack (arbitrary lag time between tasks in MS Project). The Project used all of the slack with the first ITS deliverable (delivery of the Development server was late and setup was incomplete which required rework)). This process should improve as ITS moves to an ITIL model long-term. We see the % of slack built into similar infrastructure projects could be reduced as the ITIL model allows for tracking of work effort and resource availability. The % of slack can also be reduced when a dedicated ITS Project Manager is assigned to the project. This would improve coordination with the DHHS Project Manager on project deliverables, resources, costs, and schedules.
  - If possible use resources that are shared with a maintenance team. While this adds risk over sharing resources, if the project experiences delays, it enables avoiding idle time: people can switch to maintenance. This requires good cooperation between managers, and tight prioritizing with the project's ongoing steering committee.
  - Use the same steering committee for the maintenance and new effort, if possible and if meaningful. If you share resources and decision makers, it will make concessions and prioritizing easier.
  - The Vendor (ITS) PMs must provide a detailed, resource loaded schedule.
  - Request the vendor/ITS to produce a schedule that includes workload and assign a permanent Project Manager to the effort. Ask if any resources assigned to your project are shared with others. Get a gauge for respective priorities of competing projects, so you can assess schedule risk.
  - Notify customers of the overall timeframe and workload needed of them / their team in User Acceptance Test. Schedule test time with them to ensure you agree on priorities.
  - Setup weekly status conference calls with all players during execution and implementation.
  - ITS / Vendor Pricing: make them define details and assumptions in their pricing model, and understand the details behind every line item. For example: having the details for CPU and storage enabled savings, by spreading purchases over time. Example of a "miss": the

mirroring strategy was not well defined, and not included in the initial price estimates, which adds unplanned costs at the end or forces scope cuts.

- *Project Execution*
  - Use the same steering committee for the maintenance and new effort, if possible and if meaningful. If you share resources and decision makers, it will make concessions and prioritizing easier.
  - Define Roles and Responsibilities of hardware and software to be purchased between DHHS and ITS. If some of the procurement is DHHS' responsibility, identify that and push it within DHHS. Jointly develop the architecture design. Ensure all parties understand their specific roles and responsibilities for appropriate hardware and software purchases to ensure they are procuring the correct necessary pieces. The more detailed the list (software, including version and patch numbers and hardware components, once agreed upon).
  - Any deliverable provided by any vendor must be reviewed for completeness. In this case all dates were met (in theory), but some deliverables were incomplete, which required rework and in some cases the deliverables were unusable.
  - If a deliverable consists of something the vendor has not done before, push all stakeholders to decide and agree early on architecture. In CSDW HW migration, the mirroring architecture was not finalized until 9/2/2005. The agreement on architecture was finalized in March 2005!
  - SLA: ensure the measurements you think are necessary to monitor, trend, and to perform proactive analysis are included. Ensure these measures provide a proactive approach to configuration and change management.
  - If there are disagreements between the design and/or technical decisions, determine the appropriate escalation model to review the justifications and understanding of both views to achieve final resolution. Example: Infomover – DHHS presented the technical justification and reasons to continue the use of Infomover versus FTP. A joint test was also performed to validate the two products to determine the appropriate approach to the technical solution to meet the overall business needs.
  - Plan for a cycle of overlap parallel runs so you allow discovering any problems in automation, setup etc, without disrupting operations.
  - Apply risk based testing so you do not burn out resource doing "useless" work. Agree on degree of risk and test coverage with the client. Explain your rationale. Document the agreement and final decision.
  - Setup weekly conference calls (more if required) between all technical players. Keep a 'hot' list of items, as well as a secondary list of less critical items. Review issues and risks logs and ensure that each is assigned with a specific date for resolution.
  - Document the Communications Plan and implement an escalation process to alert DHHS and ITS when the 'proper' attention it needed to resolve an outstanding issue or risk. Make sure to include the ITS Business Liaison. We have found this type of communications helps 'motivate' individuals on both sides and opens the lines of communications.

2. **LESSONS LEARNED** - What **<u>opportunities for improvements</u>** (project weaknesses) were learned with this project?

- **Looking forward – Repeat / Do not Repeat**
  - Communicate with all the players
    - CSDW Team
    - Users / Extended User groups

    - DCDL to explain changes
    - External Players (Connect Inc, Performance Matters etc.)
- Issue Resolution / Log
    - Improve internal CSDW tracking of problems and how they were resolved. Analysts sometimes overlapped in resolving the same problems.
    - Have quick stand up meetings to review those and share lessons learned as you go
- Prioritize Testing
    - Get the most important / prominent universes and queries tested first (once you pass the initial proof of concept test)
- UAT: enroll a bigger group of users to avoid being bogged down when our current ones are (Katrina and Rita impacts delayed DSS testing in HW Migration)
- UAT coordinate meetings to appoint testers so we can assess progress of testing and user proficiency (more important for BO XI migration)
- Make sure priority for the migration project has the appropriate awareness and importance as other projects such as NC FAST and/or others.
- Make sure programmers participate in testing, so they become proficient in using the tool and are better at handling help desk calls.
- CSDW needs to survey its users to ID the ones that use reports vs. query writers.